

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all claims in the application, with their current status listed parenthetically. By this Response, claims 1-8, 10-14 and 16-20 have been cancelled without prejudice to later prosecution, claims 9, 15, 21 and 22 have been amended, and new claims 23-32 are presented.

Support for new claims 23-32, and the amendments to claims 9, 15, 21 and 22 can be found in the originally-filed specification, as listed below, and in other locations of the originally-filed specification.

<b>Claim</b>	<b>Exemplary Support (by paragraph and Figure number)</b>
9	0033, 0035
15	0009, 0011, 0027, 0033, 0035
22	0009, 0030, 0033, 0035
23	0033, 0035
24	0033, 0035
25	Figs. 1A, 6, 14, 15
26	0009, 0011, 0030
27	0033, 0035
28	Figs. 1A, 6, 14, 15
29	0027, 0032
30	0009, 0011, 0033, 0035
31	Figs. 1A, 6, 14, 15
32	0027, 0032

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7-8, 10 and 22 stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. patent 5,605,505 ("Han"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 1, 7-8 and 10 have been cancelled, so the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Regarding claim 22, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id.*

Claim 22 recites:

A video game control system comprising;  
at least one controller;  
a control device interconnected to the controller, by which operation of the video game control system may be controlled to play selectively from at least two different video game systems.

Han fails to anticipate claim 22 because Han fails to teach or suggest ". . .the video game control system may be controlled to play selectively from at least two different video game systems." Instead, Han teaches a two-player game playing apparatus using wireless remote controllers. The Han apparatus uses a "game pack 2 coupled to game playing apparatus body 1 for providing a game program" (col. 1, lines 16-17). Han teaches that the "game pack provides a game program" (col. 2, lines 61), but Han fails to teach "play[ing] selectively from at least two different video game systems."

In view of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 102 rejection of independent claim 22 has been traversed.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 4 stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Han in view of U.S. patent 4,440,457 ("Fogelman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as claims 2 and 4 have been cancelled, making this rejection moot.

### **2nd Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 3, 5-6 and 15-17 stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Han in view of Fogelman, and further in view of U.S. patent 4,555,081 ("Ermanski"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 3, 5-6, and 16-17 have been cancelled, making the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 15 recites:

A video game apparatus, comprising;  
a housing having a support for a video monitor therein; and  
a control module communicating with the video monitor and comprising an  
arcade control for a video game, the control module structured to be compatible for use  
with a plurality of different video game systems.

The teaching of Han has been discussed above. Fogelman teaches a universal electronic video game cabinet, and Ermanski teaches a tiltable and swivable mounting assembly for a video display terminal. Neither Han, Fogelman or Ermanski, alone or in combination teach a ". . . control module structured to be compatible for use with a plurality of different video game systems," as recited in independent claim 15.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**3rd Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 9, 11-13 and 18-21 stand rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Han in view of U.S. patent 4,764,812 ("Hamley"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 11-13 and 18-20 have been cancelled, making the rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 9 depends from claim 15, and because claim 9 depends from claim 15, which has been distinguished from the cited art above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 9 has been traversed by virtue of its dependency from claim 15. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Claim 21 now depends from new claim 26, which is not rejected, thus making the rejection of claim 21 moot.

**4th Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claim 14 stands rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Han in view of U.S. patent 5,528,566 ("McGee"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 14 has been cancelled, making the rejection of this claim moot.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 15 and 21-32 at an early date is solicited. Enclosed with this Response is the fee for a one-month extension of time for a small entity. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

October 11, 2006

Date



Peter R. Martinez  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,845